DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 153 SP 010 685

AUTHOR Fletcher, Richard K., Jr.; Dotson, James R.
TITLE Attitudinal Changes Pre-to-Post on the Evaluation of Program Requirement Prerequisites to the Student Teaching Experience.
PUB DATE 29 Oct 76
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Southeast Regional Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Mobile, Alabama, October 29, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; *Course Evaluation; Degree Requirements; *Education Courses; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; Student Opinion; Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Tennessee Technological University

ABSTRACT

This study investigated student satisfaction with their teacher education courses and student teaching experiences. Subjects were student teachers at Tennessee Technological University during the fall of 1973 through winter 1976. An Opinionnaire was administered prior to and immediately following the student teaching experience which solicited responses to three major types of questions: (1) To what extent were specific course offerings seen as valuable to teaching? (2) To what extent was the instruction in those courses effective? and (3) To what extent did the student feel he possessed specific understandings and skills identified as objectives of those courses? Analysis of the data revealed that student teachers' perceptions of their teacher education courses and experiences significantly changed after the student teaching experience. A pattern in the responses emerged that demonstrated that the student teachers tended to rate the items relating to the nstruction and value of their courses lower after the student teaching experience and that they rated perceptions relating to their understanding of their professional areas and skills considerably higher after the student teaching experience. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132153

ATTITUDINAL CHANGES PRE-TO-POST ON THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENT PREREQUISITES TO THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Research Study

Presented at the Southeast Regional Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators-Mobile, Alabama, October 29, 1976

by

Dr. Richard K. Fletcher, Jr., Associate Professor, Secondary Education and Foundations

and

Dr. James R. Dotson, Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences and Professor of Secondary Education and Foundations

SP 010 685

College of Education
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is offered to a number of individuals who assisted in the completion of this study. Especial thanks is given to the following:

Mrs. Helene Deck, Departmental Secretary, Secondary Education and Foundations
Mrs. Mary Arnett, Secretary to the Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences
Mr. Jim Browning and Mr. Lee Grimes of the Tennessee Tech Computing Center

Other individuals such as the university supervisors, work study assistants and the student teachers who graduated from Tennessee Tech over the past two years are to be commended for their role in the investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
NEED FOR THE STUDY	2
PLAN OF THE STUDY	2
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	3
METHODOLOGY	4
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	6
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	19
EFFECTS OF THE STUDY.....	21

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade there has been a gread deal of emphasis on establishing the relevance of programs and courses offered at the collegiate level. Tennessee Tech has been an active participant in this movement. Efforts by the College of Education have taken a number of forms.

1. In 1970 a subcommittee of the Committee on Teacher Education held hearings at which the entire staff of the College of Education was invited to present objectives of professional courses for evaluation and criticism. The emphasis was on eliminating duplication and clarifying the purposes of existing courses. Some significant course changes were accomplished but there was no student involvement in the process.

2. Since that time the College has also encouraged course evaluation by students and peers. This has resulted in significant data but placed emphasis primarily on individual teaching skills and effective human relations rather than course relevance.

3. Surveys have been made of the graduates of Tennessee Tech's College of Education since 1964, but in 1970 a systematic survey of graduates in teacher education and their employers was begun. In 1973 this was supplemented by the addition of Tech's Teacher Evaluation Model which included direct observation of selected teacher graduates. In this program, however, the population consists only of graduates actually involved in teaching.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The current study resulted from a concern by the Office of Laboratory Experiences regarding the voluntary responses that student teachers provided on instruments designed to evaluate their teaching experience. Certain open ended questions generated responses critical of program components and the quality of instruction.

It was felt that earlier efforts at evaluation had placed undue emphasis on the faculty's perception of its courses and programs and in cases where students were involved, on their perception of the instructor's performance. For these reasons the decision was made to differentiate between the quality of instruction, the value of courses, perceived content preparation in the professional component. It was also felt that how students perceived these three areas was of critical importance and that these perceptions might be expected to change as a result of some experiences in teaching.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

Consequently, it was determined to administer an evaluation instrument immediately prior to student teaching and again immediately following student teaching. Student teaching at Tennessee Tech constitutes an entire quarter's work and in virtually all cases, the total professional course sequence has been completed. The instrument asked responses to three major types of questions.

1. To what extent were specific course offerings seen as valuable to teaching?
2. To what extent was the instruction in those courses effective?
3. To what extent did the student feel he possessed specific understandings and skills ordinarily identified as objectives of those courses?

The initial instrument was developed with input from faculty and administered on a trial basis at the end of the Fall, 1973, Quarter with a revised version being administered at the beginning of the Winter Quarter, 1974. The first pre-to-post assessment was made in the Spring, 1974 and has been continued since that time. Data for this study includes Fall, 1974, and Winter and Spring, 1976, which are illustrative of the total data gathered.

Additional data not presented at this session, but which yielded data important to program development, includes student perceptions for each quarter as well as by major field of study.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Tennessee Tech's professional sequence includes work at every level from the Freshman to Senior year.

1. Freshmen complete an introductory course designed to acquaint them with the profession.

2. Sophomores study in the psychological foundations including General Psychology, Human Growth and Development, and Educational Psychology.

3. Juniors and Seniors continue foundations study with Social Foundations and History and Philosophy of Education. Additionally they take from one to three methods courses depending on the area of study. Most students complete a Methods of Teaching Lab which emphasizes specific instructional skills and use of audiovisual aids.

4. All students participate in a variety of paraprofessional assignments throughout the program either in connection with specific courses or designed as practicum experiences.

METHODOLOGY

The research procedure utilized for evaluating student satisfaction with their pre-student teaching experiences and training was esentially descriptive. The opinionnaire type written survey included 47 items plus three additional categorical items. The scale chosen for rating the 47 items was a simple five-divisional scale ranging from a high of excellent to a low of poor. The data collected from the instrument were coded numerically with the assignment of a value of five for a rating of excellent to a value of one for a rating of poor. This provided for a direct input into standard statistical programs available in the university computing center. Data were collected on IBM cards which were electronically read into the computer.

The administration of the instrument to the student teacher groups consisted of pre-assessment for consecutive quarters beginning in the Winter of 1974 and continuing through Spring Quarter of 1976. The pre-assessment was completed at the general assembly of all student teachers just prior to their first day of assignment at their student teaching stations. A post-assessment was taken from student teachers during the Spring and Fall Quarters of 1974 and Winter and Spring Quarters of 1976. This was accomplished through the cooperation of the university supervisors assigned to the student teaching group. The number of returns from the post-assessment was only 75 percent of the pre-assessment. An initial pre-to-post comparison was made for the data collected during the Spring Quarter of 1974. This study has incorporated comparisons

from pre-to-post for the remaining data over the three quarters - Fall, 1974, Winter and Spring, 1976.

The statistical methods employed during the investigation provided mean ratings, standard deviations, frequency and percentages and both the chi squared and the F-ratio statistical tests. These were calculated via the subroutines available in the SPSS program available in the D. W. Mattson Computing Center at Tennessee Technological University.

[1]Norman H. Nie, et. al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, McGraw Hill Company, New York, 1975.

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The results from this investigation indicate that statistically significant changes occurred in the responses to a number of items on an assessment of student teacher ratings collected before and after the student teaching experience. Changes reflected trends which were more negative on some items and more positive on other items. Statistically significant trends were noted in more than 50 percent of the 47 items on the instrument. The results which follow are presented according to the following format: (1) The item is presented as it is stated on the instrument; (2) the frequencies, percentages, means and results from both chi squared significance test and an F-ratio significance test are included for each item; (3) the trend is identified and discussed for each item. All items on the instruments were rated according to the scale; excellent - 5 points; above average- 4 points; average - 3 points; below average - 2 points; and poor - 1 point. Mean ratings of above 3 are considered as positive and ratings below a mean of 3 are considered negative.

The chi squared statistic was obtained from the crosstabulation analysis available as an option in the SPSS program. The subprogram, CROSSTABS, calculates the two-way chi squared statistic, probability level, frequencies and percentages for each of the two subgroups (pre-test and post-test). The F-ratio statistic was calculated along with the means and standard deviations of the two subgroups as a part of the SPSS program, ONEWAY, which is alo available in the D.W. Mattson Computer Center at Tennessee Tech. The two statistical

tests generally produce similar results though one is nonparametric and the other is parametric in scope. The level of data collected via the rating scale technique merit analysis only at the non-parametric level. Therefore, the chi squared statistic should be utilized when the two tests differ.

Item 1. The degree to which the General Education requirements contributed to my development as an "educated person" was: A. Excellent; B. Above average; C. Average D. Below Average E. Poor

Pre A.15(5.2%); B.134(46.2%); C.116(40%); D.18(6.2%); E.7(2.4%); N=290; M=3.45;
Post A.16(7.2%); B.61(27.5%); C.112(50.5%); D.22(9.9%); E.11(5.0%);N=222;M=3.22;

Chi squared =20.04; Sign.=0.0005; Df=4; F=9.79; Sign.=0.002;Df_1=1; Df_2=510

The results indicate a definite shift from pre to post-assessment in the downward direction. Students who have completed their student teaching experience rated the item significantly lower after the student teaching experience than they did before the experience.

Item 2. The overall instructional program in my general education courses was:

Pre A.21(7.3%); B.126(43.6%); C.119(41.2%); D.20(6.9%); E.3(1.0%);N=289; M=3.49
PostA.10(4.5%); B.82(37.1%); C.101(45.7%); D.16(7.2%); E.12(5.4%);N=221; M=3.28

Chi squared= 11.67; Sign.=0.0200; Df=4; F=8.29; Sign.=.004;Df_1=1; Df_2=508

The results indicate a significant trend in the downward direction. Students who had completed their student teaching experience rated the item lower than they did prior to the experience.

Item 3. My insight into my own philosophy of education is:

Pre A.30(10.3%); B.151(52.1%); C.96(33.1%); D.12(4.1%); E.1(.3%);N=290; M=3.68
PostA.45(20.3%); B.113(50.9%); C.53(23.9%); D.9(4.1%); E.2(.9%); N=222; M=3.86

Chi squared= 12.84; Sign=0.0121; Df=4; F=6.65; Sign=.010;Df_1=1; Df_2=510

The results indicate a significant trend in the upward direction. Students rated the item significantly higher after completing their student teaching experience than before the experience.

Item 4. My understanding of the social foundations of education is:

Pre A. 8(2.8%); B.96(33.1%); C.141(48.6%); D.35(12.1%);E.10(3.4%);N=290;M=3.20
Post A.12(5.4%);B.82(37.1%); C.98(44.3%); D.22(10.0%); E.7(3.2%); N= 221;M=3.32

Chi squared= 3.89; Sign=0.4217; Df=4; F=2.64; Sign=.101; Df_1=1; Df_2= 509

The results indicate a slight trend upward but no statistically significant differences were found to exist between the pre and post assessments.

Item 5. My understanding of the historical background to contemporary issues is:

Pre A.18(6.2%); B.75(25.9%); C.150(51.7%); D.38(13.1%); E.9(3.1%); N=290;M=3.19
Post A.22(10.1%);B.69(31.4%); C.96(43.6%); D.28(12.7%); E.5(2.3%); N=220; M=3.34

Chi squared= 5.66; Sign=0.2260; Df=4; F=3.73; Sign=0.051; Df_1=1; Df_2= 508

The results indicate a trend upward which was statistically significant according to the analysis of variance test but not significant according to the chi squared test. Students rated the item higher after their student teaching experience than before the experience.

Item 6. My experience in my paraprofessional assignments was:

Pre A.91(31.7%); B.108(37.6%); C.56(19.5%); D.23(8.0%); E.9(3.1%); N=287;M=3.87
Post A.53(24.3%); B.77(35.3%); C.50(22.9%); D.20(9.2%); E.18(8.3%); N=218;M=3.58

Chi squared= 9.52; Sign=0.0493; Df=4; F=8.14; Sign=0.005; Df_1=1; Df_2=503

The results indicate a significant trend downward. The students still view the experience favorably, but not as favorably as they did prior to the student teaching experience.

Item 7. The <u>value</u> of my paraprofessional experience is:

Pre A.98(34.0%); B.91(31.6%); C.61(21.2%); D.27(9.4%); E.11(3.8%); N=288;M=3.83
Post A.61(27.9%); B.67(30.6%); C.50(22.8%); D.19(8.7%); E.22(10.0%);N=219;M=3.59

Chi squared= 9.18; Sign=0.567; DF=4; F=5.63; Sign=0.017; Df_1=1 Df_2= 505

The trend was significantly downward after the student teaching experience though the overall evaluation was still definitely on the positive side of average. The chi squared test was significant at only the 0.06 level while the F-ratio was much more significant.

Item 8. My preparation im my major teaching field is:

Pre A.52(17.8%); B.163(55.8%); C.68(23.3%); D.7(2.4%); E.2(.7%); N=292; M=3.88
Post A.63(28.5%); B.103(46.6%); C.45(20.4%); D.8(3.6%); E.2(.9%); N=221; M=3.98

Chi squared+ 9.69; Sign= C.0459; Df=4; F=2.23; Sign = 0.132; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

The trend was upward indicating that student teachers perceive their academic training quite favorably before the student teaching experience and better after the experience. Only the chi squared test was statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Item 9. The instructional program in my major teaching field was:

Pre A.55(18.8%); B.135(46.2%); C.81(27.7%); D.16(5.5%); E.5(1.7%); N=292;M=3.75
Post A.51(23.1%); B.99(44.8%); C.54(24.4%); D.12(5.4%); E.5(2.3%); N=221; M=3.81

Chi squared= 1.87; Sign= 0.7596; Df=4; F=.555; Sign=0.463; Df_1=1; Df_2= 511

No statistically significant trend was indicated in the way the student teachers perceived the instructional program in their major teaching field. Overall their evaluations positive.

Item 10. My preparation for developing lesson plans is:

Pre A.20(6.9%); B.103(35.4%); C.122(41.9%); D.33(11.3%);E.13(4.5%); N=291;M=3.29
Post A.40(18.1%);B.92(41.6%); C.61(27.6%); D.23(10.4%); E.5(2.3%); N=221; M=3.63

Chi squared= 23.83; Sign= 0.0001; Df=4; F=16.436; Sign= 0.0002; Df_1=1; Df_2=510

The student teachers rated their training in lesson planning significantly better after the student teaching experience than before the experience.

Item 11. My preparation for organizing and developing teaching units is:

Pre A.14(4.8%); B.99(34.1%); C.127(43.8%); D.39(13.4%); E.11(3.8%);N=290;M=3.23
Post A.39(17.6%);B.95(42.8%); C.63(28.4%); D.21(9.5%); E.4(1.8%); N=222; M=3.65

Chi squared= 33.66; Sign=0.0000; Df=4; F=27.23; Sign=.0000; Df_1=1; Df_2=510

The student teachers rated their preparation for using unit plans significantly better after the student teaching experience than before the experience.

Item 12. My preparation for evaluating pupil progress is:

Pre A.11(3.8%); B.111(38.3%);C.138(47.6%);D.23(7.9%);E.7(2.4%); N=290; M=3.33
Post A.33(14.9%);B.102(46.2%);C.76(34.4%); D.6(2.7%); E.4(1.8%); N=221; M=3.70

Chi squared= 31.38; Sign=.0000; Df=4; F=26.45; Sign= .0000; Df_1=1; Df_2=509

The student teachers perceive their preparation for evaluating pupils significantly better after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience.

Item 13. My preparation for developing and maintaining pupil interest in class activities is:

Pre A.18(6.2%); B.121(41.7%);C.127(47.2%);D.12(4.1%); E.2-(.7%); N=290;M= 3.49
Post A.26(11.8%);B.115(52.3%); C.70(31.8%); D.7(3.2%); E.2(.9%); N=220; M=3.71

Chi squared= 15.29; Sign= 0.0041; Df=4; F=11.79; Sign= 0.0010; Df_1=1; Df_2=508

Student teachers perceive their preparation for developing student interest significantly more favorably after the student teaching experience than before the experience.

Item 14. My preparation in the psychology of learning is:

Pre A.19(6.6%); B.105(36.3%); C.140(48.4%);D.22(7.6%); E.3(1.0%); N=289;M=3.40
Post A.19(8.6%); B.80(36.2%); C.101(45.7%); D.19(8.6%); E.2(0.9%); N=221;M=3.71

Chi squared=1.06; Sign=0.90; DF=4; F=0.21; Sign=0.64; Df_1=1; Df_2= 508

Student teachers do not perceive their preparation in the psychology of learning measurably different prior and after their student teaching experiences. Their overall rating of this area is only slightly above average.

Item 15. My preparation for handling specific behavior problems is:

Pre A.18(6.3%); B.86(30 %); C.143(50.0%); D.30(10.5%); E.9(3.1%); N=28[illegible] M=3.26
Post A.17(7.7%); B.82(37.3%); C.86(39.1%); D.25(11.4%); E.10(4.5%); N=220;M=3.32

Chi squared= 6.32; Sign=0.18; Df=4; F=0.65; Sign=0.43; Df_1=1, Df_2=504

There is no statistically significant changes in student teacher attitudes relating to maintaining discipline resulting from their student teaching experience. The most noticeable change, though nonsignificant, is the shift from the average to the above average rating of the item. The overall ratings for this item were average.

Item 16. My understanding of the developmental characteristics of the specific age group which I am prepared to teach is:

Pre A.30(10.3%); B.138(47.3%);C.105(36.0%);D.16(5.5%); E.3(1.0%);N=292;M=36.0
Post A.52(23.5%); B.94(42.5%);C.61(27.6%); D.12(5.4%); E.2(0.9%); N=221; M=3.82

Chi squared=17.18; Sign=0.002; Df=4; F=8.90; Sign=0.003; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

Student teachers perceive their understanding of child development significantly more favorably after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience. Their overall ratings for this item were above average.

Item 17. My preparation for utilizing audio-visual aids in my teaching is:

Pre A.44(15.1%); B.141(48.5%);C.81(27.8%);D.18(6.2%); E.7(2.4%); N=291;M=3.68
Post A.44(19.9%); B.97(43.9%); C.62(28.1%); D.13(5.9%); E.5(2.3%);N=221;M=3.73

Chi squared= 2.27; Sign=0.69; Df=4; Sign=0.50; Df_1=1; Df_2=510

Student teachers do not change their perceptions toward their preparatory programs as a result of their student teaching experiences.

Item 18. My preparation in understanding the factors that determine my own teaching personality and motivation is:

Pre A.27(9.2%); B.125(42.8%); C.126(43.2%);D. 12(4.1%); E.2(0.7%); N=292;M=3.56
Post A.27(12.2%); B.108(48.9%); C.79(35.7%); D.5(2.3%); E.2(0.9%);N=221;M=3.69

Chi squared= 5.17; Sign= 0.27; Df=4; F=4.05; Sign=0.04; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

The results from the two statistical tests indicate different results. The F-ratio indicated a significant trend upward while the chi squared test revealed a shift upward which was not statistically significant.

Item 19. My preparation for teaching students requiring remedial work is:

Pre A.17(5.9%); B.79(27.2%);C 124(42.8%); D.59(20.3%); E.11(3.8%); N=290 M=3.11
Post A.15(6.8%); B.73(33.2%); C.85(38.6%);D.35(15.9%); E.12(5.5%); N=220; M=3.20

Chi squared= 4.28; Sign= 0.37; Df=4; F=1.12; Sign= 0.29; Df_1=1; Df_2= 508

Student teachers give this item an overall rating of average and do not significantly alter their perceptions of their preparation for teaching remedial work to students as a result of their student teaching experience.

Item 20. My preparation for teaching students of average ability is:

Pre A.24(8.2%); B.159(54.6%); C.99(34.0%); D.9(3.1%); E.0(0.0%); N=291; M=3.68
Post A.29(13.1%); B.126(57.0%); C.59(26.7%); D.6(2.7%); E.1(0.5%);N=221; M=3.80

Chi squared: 6.57%; Sign= 0.16; Df=4; F=3.57; Sign=0.06; Df_1=1; Df_2= 510

There is an upward trend from pre to post-assessment on student teachers perceptions of their training for teaching students of average ability. Overall the student teachers rate this item above average.

Item 21. My preparation for teaching students of above average ability is:

Pre A. 15(5.1%); B.108(37.0%); C.129(44.2%);D.38(13.0%); E.2(0.7%); N=292;M=3.33
Post A.32(14.5%); B.93(42.1%); C. 81(36.7%); D.10(4.5%); E. 5(2.3%); N=221;M=3.62

Chi Squared = 26.54; Sign=0.00; Df=4; F=15.63; Sign=0.00; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

Student teachers perceive their preparation for teaching students of above average ability significantly more positive after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience.

Item 22. My knowledge relative to teacher employment procedures, benefits, and privileges is:

Pre A.13(4.5%); B.55(18.8%); C.137(46.9%); D.71(24.3%); E.16(5.5%);N=292;M=2.92
Post A.20(9.0%); B.56(25.3%);C. 88(39.8%); D.40(18.1%); E. 17(7.7%); N=221:M=3.10

Chi squared= 11.24; Sign=0.02; DF=4; F=4.07; Sign= 0.04; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

Student teachers perceive their knowledge relative to teacher employment procedures significantly better after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience. However, their overall feelings relating to this item reflect only an average understanding.

Item 23. My knowledge of curricular trends in my area of teaching is:

Pre A.22(7.5%); B.106(36.3%); C.125(42.8%); D.35(12.0%); E.4(1.4%);N=292;M=3.37
Post A.19(8.6%); B.93(42.3%); C.91(41.4%); D.13(5.9%); E. 4(1.8%); N=220; M=3.50

Chi squared= 6.51; Sign- 0.16; Df=4; F= 3.27; Sign= 0.07; Df_1=1; Df_2= 510

The results indicate that student teachers have a more positive but nonsignificantly better perception of their knowledge of curricular trends after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience.

Item 24. The degree to which my professional education courses have enabled me to become self-evaluative is:

Pre A.18(6.2%); B.105(36.0%); C.14.0(47.9%); D.25(8.6%); E.4(1.4%);N=292;M=3.37
Post A.23(10.4%);B.80(36.2%); C.85(38.5%); D.24(10.9%); E.9(4.1%); N=221; M=3.38

Chi squared=9.74; Sign= 0.05; Df=4; F=0.02; Sign=0.61; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

The results indicate significantly different feelings after the student teaching experience than before the experience as measured by the chi squared test. However, due to a shift from the average column in both the upward and downward directions there was little change in the overall mean ratings and thus no significant difference was found in the F-ratio.

Item 25. The degree to which faculty in the College of Education serve as positive models of good teaching was:

Pre A.20(6.9%); B.100(34.5%);C.116(40.0%);D.33(11.4%);E.2(7.2%); N=290; M=3.22
Post A.21(9.5%);B.62(28.1%); C.79(35.7%); D. 33(14.9%); E.26(11.8%); N=221;M=3.09

Chi squared= 7.31; Sign=0.12; Df=4; F=2.16; Sign = 0.14; Df_1=1; Df_2=509

The overall perceptions of student teachers toward the faculty in the College of Education both before and after the student teaching experience are relatively unchanged and reflect a rating of average.

Item 26. The degree to which College of Education serve as positive models of good teaching was:

Pre A.50(17.1%); B.109(37.3%); C.108(37.0%); D.21(7.2%); E.4(1.4%); N=292;M=3.62
Post A.36(6.3%;);B. 61(27.6%); C.90(40.7%); D 22(10.0%); E.12(5.4%);N=221;M=3.39

Chi squared = 11.89; Sign=0.62; DF=4; F=6.71; Sign=0.01; Df_1=1; Df_2=511

The trend manifested in the pre to post-assessments is significantly downward. Student teachers rated the item lower after the experience than before the experience and the overall rating was only slightly above average.

Item 27. The value of Psychology 201 (General Psychology) to my professional development was:

Pre A.23(8.0%); B.74(25.8%); C.103(35.9%); D.65(22.6%); E.22(7.7%);N=287;M=3.04
Post A.20(9.1%); B.49(22.4%); C.87(39.7%); D.40(18.3%); E.23(10.5%);N=219;M=3.01

Chi squared = 3.54; Sign = 0.47; Df=4; F=0.06; Sign = 0.69; Df_1=1; Df_2= 504

The overall rating of student teachers indicated that the value of general psychology is of only average standing. There were no statistically significant changes resulting from the student teaching experience.

Item 28. The instruction in Psychology was:

Pre A.34(12.1%); B.64(22.9%); C.114(40.7%);D.46(16.4%); E.22(7.9%);N=280;M=3.15
Post A.24(11.1%); B.56(25.8%); C.86(39.6%); D.27(12.4%); E.24(11.1%);N=217;M=3.13

Chi squared = 3.28; Sign= 0.51; Df=4; F=0.03; Sign = 0.65; Df_1=1; Df_2= 495

The overall rating for the item was average and there was no significant change in the perceptions of student teachers as a result of their student teaching experience.

Item 29. The degree of warmth and interest with which I was received when I sought help from my adviser was:

Pre A. 96(33.0%); B.84(28.9%); C.64(22.0%);D.28(9.6%); E.19(6.5%); N=291;M=3.72
Post A.72(33.0%); B.67(30.7%); C.43(19.7%); D.23(10.6%); E.13(6.0%);N=218;M=3.74

Chi squared = 0.62; Sign = 0.96; Df=4; F = 0.04; Sign = 0.67; Df_1=1; Df_2=507

The results indicate an overall rating of slightly above average for the item. There was not a significantly different trend which resulted from the student teaching experience.

Item 30. The advising system at Tennessee Tech is:

Pre A.28(9.6%);B.79(27.1%);C.113(38.8%);D.53(18.2%);E.18(6.2%); N=291; M=3.16
Post A.22(10.0%);B.62(28.8%);C.76(34.7%); D.28(12.8%);E.30(13.7%);N=219;M=3.09

Chi squared = 10.53; Sign = 0.03; Df=4; F = 0.53; Sign = 0.47; Df_1=1; Df_2=508

The results from the chi squared test revealed a significant change from the pre to post assessment with a slightly downward trend. The results from the F-ratio were not significant at the 0.05 level of measurement. The overall rating for the item was average.

Item 31. The degree to which I agree with the following statement is: (Tennessee Tech is a student-oriented university.)

Pre A.22(7.6%); B.76(26.2%); C.123(42.4%); D.43(14.8%); E.26(9.0%);N=290;M=3.09
Post A.18(8.1%); B.46(20.8%); C.84(38.0%); D.48(21.7%); E.25(11.3%);N=221;M=2.93

Chi squared = 6.22; Sign = 0.18; Df=4; F = 2.80; Sign = 0.09; Df_1=1; Df_2= 509

The results indicate a downward trend on the ratings for the item but the statistical tests indicated no significant differences at the 0.05 level. The overall rating for the item was average.

Item 32. The <u>value</u> of microteaching to my professional development was:

Pre A.72(27.0%); B.105(39.3%); C.55(20.6%);D.20(7.5%); E.15(5.6%);N=267;M=3.74
Post A.44(21.7%); B.77(37.9%); C.51(25.1%); D.18(8.9%); E.13(6.4%);N=203;M=3.60

Chi squared = 2.80; Sign = 0.59; Df=4; F = 2.09; Sign = 0.15; Df_1=1; Df_2=468

The results indicate a downward trend but neither of the significance tests reveal it to be significant at the 0.05 level. The overall rating for the item is above average.

Item 33. The instruction and supervision in microteaching was:

Pre A.59(22.3%); B.101(38.3%);C.70(26.5%);D.26(9.8%); E.8(3.0%); N=264; M=3.67
Post A.47(23.3%); B.61(30.2%); C.60(29.7%);D.19(9.4%); E.15(7.4%);N=202; M=3.52

Chi squared = 7.10; Sign = 0.13; Df=4; F = 2.05; Sign = 0.15; Df_1=1; Df_2=464

The results indicate a downward trend but neither of the significance tests reveal it to be significant at the 0.05 level. The overall rating for the item is above average.

Item 34. The value of FOED 101, Introduction to Teaching, was:

Pre A.16(6.0%); B.55(20.5%); C.87(32.5%);D.61(22.8%); E.48(17.9%); N=268 M=2.73
Post A.12(5.8%); B.35(17.0%); C.60(29.1%); D.46(22.3%);E.53(25.7%);N=206; M=2.55

Chi squared = 5.31; Sign = 0.38; Df=4; F = 2.67 Sign = 0.10; Df_1 = 1; Df_2 = 472

The overall rating for the item was slightly below average on both the pre and post-assessments. Neither of the two significance tests reflected any statistically significant difference between pre and post-assessments.

Item 35. The instruction in FOED 101 was:

Pre A.24(9.0%); B.65(24.4%); C.96(36.1%);D.45(16.9%); E.36(13.5%);N=266;M=2.98
Post A.19(9.3%); B.47(23.0%); C.67(32.8%);D.28(13.7%); E.43(21.1%);N=204;M=2.86

Chi squared = 5.12; Sign = 0.27; Df = 4; F = 1.30; Sign = 0.25; df_1=1; Df_2=468

The overall rating for the item was average and though a downward trend is manifested from the pre to post assessments there were no statistically significant differences from the two significance tests.

Item 36. The value of FOED 222, Human Growth and Development, was:

Pre A.29(10.5%); B.97(35.1%); C.120(43.5%); D.22(8.0%); E.8(2.9%); N=276; M=3.42
Post A.22(10.4%); B.73(34.6%);C.88(41.7%);D.17(8.1%); E.11(5.2%); N=211; M=3.37

Chi squared = 1.74; Sign = 0.78; Df = 4; F=0.42; Sign = 0.53; Df_1=1; Df_2=485

The overall rating by the student teachers was slightly above average and there were no statistically signfficant differences revealed by the two tests of significance between the pre and post-assessments.

Item 37. The instruction in FOED 222 was:

Pre A.41(14.9%); B.93(33.8%); C.103(37.5%); D.24(8.7%); E.14(5.1%); N=275;M=3.45
Post A.33(15.7%);B.74(35.2%); C.74(35.2%); D.16(7.6%); E.13(6.2%); N=210; M=3.47

Chi squared = 0.72;Sign = 0.95; Df=4; F = 0.04; Sign = 0.67; Df_1=1; Df_2= 483

Student teachers did not perceive the instruction in FOED 222 differently as a result of their student teaching experiences. Their overall ratings for the item were slightly above average.

Item 38. The value of FOED 223, Educational Psychology, was:

Pre A.26(9.2%); B.82(29.1%); C.120(42.6%); D.35(12.4%); E.19(6.7%); N=282;M=3.22
Post A.19(8.8%);B.57(26.4%); C.87(40.3%); D.39(18.1%); E.14(6.5%); N=216; M=3.13

Chi squared = 3.13; Sign = 0.54; Df = 4; F = 0.90; Sign = 0.35; Df_1=1; Df_2=496

Student teachers rated the value of educational psychology slightly but not significantly lower after their student teaching experiences than before the experience. Their overall ratings for the item were average.

Item 39. The instruction in FOED 223 was:

Pre A.26(9.2%) B.72(25.5%);C.112(39.7%); D.49(17.4%); E.23(8.2%); N=282;M=3.11
Post A.27(12.6%);B.44(20.6%);C.78(36.4%); D.39(18.2%); E.26(12.1%); N=214;M=3.03

Chi squared = 4.95; Sign = 0.29; Df = 4; F= 0.49; Sign = 0.49; Df_1=1; Df_2=494

The overall ratings for the item were average and though a slight downward trend is noticed from the pre to post-assessment there were no statistically significant differences.

Item 40. The value of FOED 301, Social Foundations of Education, was:

Pre A.12(4.2%); B.58(20.4%); C.108(37.9%);D.63(22.1%); E.44(15.4%);N=285;M=2.76
Post A.12(5.5%);B.33(15.2%); C.67(30.9%);D.56(25.8%); E.49(22.6%); N=217; M=2.55

Chi squared = 8.09; Sign - 0.0883; Df = 4; F = 4.18; Sign - 0.04; Df_1=1; Df_2=500

The overall ratings for the item are slightly below average and the student teachers perceive the value of the course less favorably after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience. The chi squared significance test revealed that the difference was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level though close (0.09). The F-ratio indicated statistical significance.

Item 41. The instruction in FOED 301 was:

Pre A.12(4.2%); B.52(18.3%);C. 115(40.5%); D.59(20.8%);E.46(16.2%);N=284;M=2.74
Post A.12(5.5%);B.41(18.9%);C. 62(28.6%); D.49(22.6%); E.53(24.4%); N=217;M=2.58

Chi squared = 9.807; Sign.= 0.0438; Df=4; F=2.19; Sign = 0.14; Df_1=1; Df_2=499

The results indicate a downward trend which was determined to be statistically significant by the chi squared analysis and slightly but not statistically significant by the analysis of variance significance test. The overall ratings for the item were slightly below average.

Item 42. The value of FOED 302, History and Philosophy of Education was:

Pre A.45(16.2%);B.85(30.6%); C.106(38.1%);D.30(10.8%);E.12(4.3%);N=278;M=3.43
Post A.27(12.7%);B.59(27.7%); C.83(39.0%); D.25(11.7%);E.19(8.9%);N=213;M=3.23

Chi squared = 5.52; Sign=0.2379; Df=4; F=4.34; Sign = 0.04; Df_1=1; Df_2= 489

Student teachers perceive the value for history and philosophy of education less favorably after they have experienced student teaching than before. The downward trend is statistically significant as determined from the analysis of variance test of significance. The results from the chi squared significance test reflect a trend but no statistical significance at the 0.05 level. The overall ratings for the item were slightly above average.

Item 43. The instruction in FOED 302 was:

Pre A.66(24.0%); B.99(36.0%);C.88(32.0%); D.16(5.8%); E.6(2.2%); N=275;M=3.74
Post A.44(20.7%); B.69(32.4%);C.65(30.5%); D.20(9.4%); E.15(7.0%);N=213;M=3.50

Chi squared = 9.797; Sign = 0.0440; Df=4; F=6.19; Sign = 0.01; Df_1=1; Df_2=486

Student teachers rate the instruction in history and philosophy of education above average but tend to rate the item significantly lower after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience.

Item 44 - The <u>value</u> of FOED 330, Evaluation and Guidance, was:

Pre A.46(16.3%); B.105(37.2%);C.103(36.5%);D.18(6.4%); E.10(3.5%);N=282; M=3.56
Post A.40(18.9%); B.67(31.6%); C.69(32.5%); D.19(9.0%); E.17(8.0%);N=212; M=3.44

Chi squared = 7.6105; Sign =0.1069; Df=4; F=1.63; Sign - 0.20; Df_1=1; Df_2=492

Student teachers rate the item slightly above average and tend to perceive their value of this course evaluation and guidance slightly but not significantly less favorably after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience.

Item 45. The instruction in FOED 330 was:

Pre A.61(21.9%); B.87(31.3%); C.93(33.5%);D.24(8.6%);E.13(4.7%); N=278;M=3.57
Post A.39(18.3%); B.72(33.8%); C.59(27.7%);D.20(9.4%);E.23(10.8%);N=213;M=3.39

Chi squared = 8.5467; Sign = 0.0735; Df=4; F=2.99; Sign=0.08; Df_1=1; Df_2=489

The overall rating for the instruction in evaluation and guidance was slightly above average. Student teachers perceived the item less favorably after the student teaching experience than prior to the experience but the downward trend was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Item 46. The value of my methods course(s) was:

Pre A.84(29.4%); B.117(40.9%);C.64(22.4%);D.15(5.2%); E.6(2.1%); N=286; M=3.90
Post A.54(24.4%); B.84(38.0%); C.51(23.1%); D.19(8.6%);E.13(5.9%); N=221;M=3.66

Chi squared = 8.2612; Sign=0.0825; Df=4; F=6.64; Sign = 0.01; Df_1=1; Df_2= 505

The student teachers rate the value of their method(s) course(s) above average. However, there is a strong and sometimes significant trend in the downward direction between the pre and post-assessment. The analysis of variance test was significant at the 0.01 level while the chi squared significance test produced only a slight significance at the 0.08 level.

Item 47. The instruction in my methods course(s) was:

Pre A.67(23.8%); B.117(41.6%); C. 71(25.3%);D.16(5.7%); E.10(3.6%); N=281;M=3.76
Post A.44(20.3%); B.81(37.3%); C.60(27.6%); D.15(6.9%); E. 17(7.8%); N=217;M=3.55

Chi squared = 5.9554; Sign = 0.2025; Df=4; F=4.97; Sign =0.02; Df_1=1; Df_2=496

Student teachers rate their instruction in the methods courses above average but tend to lower their perceptions after their student teaching experiences. The results from the two significance tests reveal significant differences between pre and post-assessment on the analysis of variance test and no statistical significance on the chi squared test.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The results from the investigation reveal that student teachers do significantly change their perceptions of the courses and experiences which they completed before entering the student teaching experience. Fairly definite trends from pre-to-post assessment were identified in all but six of the 47 items. Statistical significance was found in a sizeable number of the items as has been reported in the previous pages of this report.

An effort to determine the meaning of the changes was made through factor analysis of the pre-assessment scores which resulted in the identification of 14 factors. Further study of the factors did not provide sufficient explanation for the changes which were depicted between the pre-and-post assessments. Inspection did reveal that there seems to be a definite pattern that developed which demonstrates that the student teachers tended to rate both the items relating to the instruction and the value of their courses lower after the student teaching experience and that likewise they rated perceptions relating to themselves and especially their understanding of their professional areas and skills considerably higher after the experience. There was also a tendency to rate items relating to the university structure lower after the experience than before it. The items relating to general psychology, human growth and development and their advisor were the only items which were relatively stable though many of the above trends were not determined to be significantly different from chance at the 0.05 level of measurement.

Another pattern which seems to be revealed from the results of the investigation is that there is a somewhat higher overall mean rating for courses and experiences which were more practical than theoretical. The methods courses were generally perceived more favorably than foundations courses. However, a considerable difference was manifested between ratings in methods courses from different areas and variations in the ratings relating to the several foundation courses were very much evident which suggests that course ratings are definitely affected by course instructors.

EFFECTS OF THE STUDY

Although the study is of a continuing nature, sufficient data has been produced to suggest, along with supportive research, changes implemented by the College of Education.

1. In Spring, 1976, a curriculum committee was established to consider courses judged ineffective by students and to plan modifications. Recommendations are under consideration which will identify competencies which can be met through field involvement in a practicum setting.

2. In the adjoining room is a presentation of our new programs of field based instruction in two elementary education courses. A practicum has been established to accompany them and during the Winter, 1977, a portable unit will be attached to an area school to house the micro-teaching program.

3. University supervisors are committed to making a conscious effort to bridge the gap between theory and performance in their work with student teachers. This is reflected in the text our staff has developed for student teachers.

4. Consideration is being given to the development of a systematic program of evaluation throughout the teacher education program rather than as a follow-up activity only.